REMARKS

Claims 22-29 and 33-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 22, 26, 27, 29 and 33 are amended. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 22-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,314,466 to Agarawal et al. (hereafter Agarwal) in view of U.S. Patent 6,738,980 to Lin et al. (hereafter Lin), U.S. Patent 6,104,441 to Wee et al. (hereafter Wee) and WO 03/028293 to Aksu et al. (hereafter Aksu). The Office Action also rejects claims 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lin in view of Wee and Aksu. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 22 recites receiving, by a transmitting server, information of a specific random access point from a remote unit, the specific random access point being input by the user at the remote unit, searching for the specific random access point in a content file stored in the transmitting server in response to the transmitting server receiving the information of the specific random access point input by the user of the remote unit. Independent claim 22 also recites reconfiguring a data stream based on a screen type of the specific random access point input by the user and a coincidence between the specific random access point and a data transmission starting point. Independent claim 22 also recites that reconfiguring the data stream comprises: determining an existing I-frame that is most similar to the specific random access point when the specific random access point is determined to be a P-frame and is the data transmission starting point, converting the P-frame into a new I-frame based on values of the

existing I-frame and a next P-frame, performing the converting until the next P-frame is the

specific random access point to convert the P-frame random access point into a new I-frame,

configuring a media data sample based on the new I-frame as the data transmission starting

point, configuring a new data stream using the media data sample and continuous media data

samples, and converting a header of the media data sample into a representative header.

Independent claim 22 also recites transmitting the new data stream including the converted

representative header from the transmitting server to the remote unit.

In at least one non-limiting example, FIG. 7 and paragraphs [62] and [66] of the present

specification describe that when <u>a specific random access point from a user</u> is associated with a

P-frame, the P-frame is converted into an I-frame. The converted I-frame may then be

determined as a data transmission starting point. Additionally, <u>a segment header (moof) of a</u>

<u>media data sample having the converted I-frame may be converted into a representative header</u>

<u>(moov)</u>.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 22.

More specifically, the applied references (including <u>Agarwal</u>) do not teach or suggest receiving,

by a transmitting server, information of a specific random access point from a remote unit, the

specific random access point being input by the user at the remote unit, and searching for the

specific random access point in a content file stored in the transmitting server in response to the

transmitting server receiving the information of the specific random access point input by the

user at the remote unit. Independent claim 22 specifically relates to <u>a specific random access</u>

<u>point</u> input by a user of a remote unit.

In at least one non-limiting example, the present specification describes transmitting a file from <u>a specific access point input by a user</u>. Agarwal relates to files being processed as different segments and that a file may be generated from a selected segment. Because the file is generated from the selected segment, a file may not be generated from a specific access point input by a user. The Office Action states that Agarwal relates to accessing the multimedia data object <u>at a user specified segment</u>. See Agarwal's col. 8, line 18-col. 19, line 27; and FIG. 6. This does not teach or suggest receiving information of <u>a specific random access point</u> (<u>input by a user</u> at a remote unit) and/or <u>searching for the specific random access point</u>, as recited in independent claim 22.

Agarwal also does not teach or suggest reconfiguring a data stream according to <u>a screen type of the specific random access point input by the user</u> and a coincidence between <u>the specific random access point</u> and a data transmission starting point. See the Office Action on page 4. Agarwal does not generate a file from a specific access point input by a user and transmit the generated file.

For at least these reasons, Agarwal does not teach or suggest the specific features of independent claim 22 relating to the specific random access point input by the user. The other applied references do not teach or suggest these missing features. For example, Lin does not teach or suggest reconfiguring a data stream based on a screen type of the specific random access point input by the user.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Agarwal, Lin, Wee and Aksu do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 22. Thus, independent claim 22 defines patentable

subject matter.

Independent claim 33 recites receiving information of <u>a specific random access point that</u> <u>was input by a user</u>, determining a P-frame <u>associated with the specific random access point</u> <u>input by the user</u>, and determining an I-frame that is most similar to the determined P-frame. Independent claim 33 also recites converting a next P-frame that is adjacent to the determined I-frame into a new I-frame based on information of the next P-frame and the I-frame, configuring a media data sample by setting the converted new I-frame as a data transmission starting point after the converting into the new I-frame, converting a header of the configured media data sample into a representative header, and transmitting a data stream having the converted header and the configured media data samples.

For at least similar reasons, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 33. More specifically, Agarwal (and the other applied references) does not teach or suggest receiving information of a specific random access point that was input by a user, determining a P-frame associated with the specific random access point input by the user, and determining an I-frame that is most similar to the determined P-frame. Thus, independent claim 33 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 22 and 33 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 22-29 and 33-34 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah
Date: July 16, 2010
Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610